

REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 7, 2009, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-12, 16-20, 24, 25 and 30 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination. Claims 5-7, 13-15, 21-23 and 28 have been withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, Claim 1 has been amended to be in better form. No new matter has been introduced.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 1 is objected to for informalities. The amendments made to Claim 1 has overcome the objection. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully submtited.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-12, 16-20, 24, 25 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,107,944 to Behr et al., (hereinafter, "Behr"). The Applicant hereby traverses the rejection, as follows.

In rejecting the claims, the Office Action simply asserts that Behr, in col. 4, lines 30-50, teaches a navigational device using an origin and destination that inherently have diagonal vertices lying in a rectangular area and covering the route. However, the disclosure of col. 4, lines 30-50 of Behr merely describers that "a calculating means at the base unit for calculating a route between the origin and destination," and "the guidance information may include navigation instructions from an origin to a destination, information about one or more points of interest within a particular region, or other geographically referenced information." There is no disclosure in Behr either in the portions cited by the Examiner or elsewhere, or inherent or equivalent features with

respect to' the navigation apparatus transmitting the start location and the destination location to the server apparatus in order to that acquire therefrom map information of unit areas that covers a rectangular area of which two diagonal vertices coincide with the start and destination locations," as recited in amended Claim 1.

Further, Figs. 6-10 of Behr merely show routing directions from an origin to a destination. They do not cover "a rectangular area of which two diagonal vertices coincide with the start and destination locations," as recited in amended Claim 1.

For similar reasons, Behr fails to teach or suggest at least the combination of features that "continuous map information from a start location to a destination location is stored in the map information storage section, and, if there exists any other continuous combination, the navigation apparatus transmits the start location and the destination location to the server apparatus"; and "acquire therefrom map information consisting of unit areas that covers a rectangular area of which two diagonal vertices coincide with the start and destination locations," as recited in Claim 10, and at least the combination of features that "if continuous map information from a start location to a destination location is stored in the map information storage section, a route is searched for, and the navigation apparatus acquires from the server apparatus map information consisting of unit areas that covers an area including and neighboring the retrieved route," as recited in Claim 18.

Further, Behr fails to teach or suggest at least the combination of features of transmitting "to the navigation apparatus map information consisting of unit areas that covers a rectangular area of which two diagonal vertices coincide with the start and destination locations," as recited in Claim 30.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Behr does not anticipate any of the independent claims of the present application. Should the Examiner persists in asserting that Behr anticipates the currently pending claims, he/she is respectfully requested to specifically point out what part of Behr teaches what part of the claims, instead of giving a rough overview as in the Office Action.

Further, as Claims 1, 10, 18, and 30 are not anticipated by Behr and are allowable over the cited art, Claims 2, 4, 8-11, 12, 16-17, 19-20, 24, 25, which depend from allowable independent Claims 1, 10, or 18, are likewise allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claims 1, 10, and 18, and additional features recited therein.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to

charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300 referencing client matter number 103213-00102.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox LLP



Wan-Ching Montfort
Registration No. 56,127

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6323
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395

CMM/CYM:vw